

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**  
U.S. Application No.: 09/828,889  
Attorney Docket No.: Q63958

**REMARKS**

**I. General Remarks**

Claims 1-27 are all the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections. All of Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Koritzinsky, U.S. Patent No. 6,272,469 (“Koritzinsky”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as discussed below.

Examiner Interviews. Telephone interviews were conducted with Examiner Sherr on May 25, 2004 and on June 1, 2004. A Statement of the Substance of the Interview follows for each of these interviews.

**II. Statement of the Substance of the Interview of May 25, 2004.**

During the telephone interview of May 25, 2004, the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1-27 over Koritzinsky was discussed. The Examiner agreed that Koritzinsky and the other references cited, but not relied upon, by the Examiner (Ginter et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,237,786; Sprague et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,247,575; and Sirbu et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,808,144), are not sufficiently on point to warrant a rejection of the claims. Therefore, the rejection of the claims over Koritzinsky will be withdrawn. In view of this, the Examiner kindly agreed to withdraw the finality of the April 14, 2004 Office Action, and to issue another Office Action after having performed an additional prior art search for more pertinent references, if such exist. It was also agreed that the Applicants would respond to the April 14, 2004 Office Action, arguing that the references were not on point, and including a Statement of the Substance of the Interview.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**  
U.S. Application No.: 09/828,889  
Attorney Docket No.: Q63958

**III. Statement of the Substance of the Interview of June 1, 2004**

During the telephone interview of June 1, 2004, Applicants explained the general state of the conventional art, and the invention of the present application, as set out in the specification. The Examiner again agreed to withdraw the finality of the April 14, 2004 Office Action, and to issue another Office Action after having performed an further prior art search for additional references.

**IV. Claim Rejections**

Regarding the Examiner's §102(e) rejection of Claim 1-27 over Koritzinsky, Applicants submit that the Koritzinsky reference is unrelated to the present invention, and fails to disclose or suggest the claimed limitations thereof, for at least the reasons set out in pages 12-16 of Applicants' January 7, 2004 Amendment, incorporated herein by reference.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claims 1-27 over Koritzinsky.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**

U.S. Application No.: 09/828,889

Attorney Docket No.: Q63958

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz  
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 9, 2004